



PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
UNIVERSITY

The effects of fatigued working memory functions on hypothesis testing during acquisition of a motor skill

Hoskens, Merel; Uiga, Liis; Cooke, Andrew; Capio, Catherine; Masters, Rich

Journal of Experimental Psychology: General

DOI:

[10.1037/xge0000905](https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000905)

Accepted/In press: 03/09/2021

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Hoskens, M., Uiga, L., Cooke, A., Capio, C., & Masters, R. (Accepted/In press). The effects of fatigued working memory functions on hypothesis testing during acquisition of a motor skill. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000905>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

The effects of fatigued working memory functions on hypothesis
testing during acquisition of a motor skill

Merel C.J. Hoskens^{1*}, Liis Uiga², Andrew Cooke³, Catherine M. Capio^{1, 4}
& Rich S.W. Masters¹

1: Te Huataki Waiora School of Health, University of Waikato, NZ

2: Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK

3: School of Sport, Health & Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, UK

4: Centre for Educational and Developmental Sciences, the Education University of Hong
Kong, HK

Corresponding author*:

Merel Hoskens

School of Health

University of Waikato

Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand

E: mcjhh1@students.waikato.ac.nz

[Author Note: Portions of the data analysed in this manuscript was presented at the annual
conference of Sport and Exercise Science New Zealand, 2019. This study was not
preregistered.](#)

Word count: 9944

1 Abstract

Implicit motor learning paradigms aim to minimise verbal-analytical engagement in motor performance. Some paradigms do this by decreasing working memory activity during practice, which reduces explicit processes associated with the search for motor solutions (e.g., hypothesis testing). Here we designed a mentally demanding motor task to fatigue working memory prior to motor practice and then tested whether it reduced hypothesis testing. Fifty-nine participants were randomly assigned to complete the mentally demanding motor task (cognitive fatigue group) or to complete an undemanding motor task (non-fatigued control group). Feelings of fatigue, working memory functions, electroencephalography (EEG) Fz power and vagal control were assessed pre- and post-task to quantify the effect of the mentally demanding motor task on cognitive fatigue. Thereafter, an adapted shuffleboard task was completed to determine the impact on hypothesis testing. Hypothesis testing was assessed by self-report, technique changes and equipment-use solutions. Additionally, verbal-analytical engagement in motor performance was (indirectly) gauged with EEG T7-Fz connectivity and T7 power measures. Participants in the cognitive fatigue group reported more fatigue, and displayed moderated working memory functions and Fz theta power. During practice of the shuffleboard task, participants also displayed more technique changes and higher verbal-analytical engagement in motor planning (EEG T7-Fz connectivity), compared to participants in the control group. The mentally demanding motor task suppressed working memory functions, but resulted in more, rather than less, hypothesis testing during shuffleboard practice. The implications are discussed in the context of implicit motor learning theory.

Key words: fatigue, electroencephalography, conscious control, implicit motor learning, executive functions

2 General introduction

It has been claimed that working memory supports the processing, storage and manipulation of information (Baddeley, 1992; Bo & Seidler, 2009; Just & Carpenter, 1992; Kane & Engle, 2002) and underpins explicit motor learning by supporting the development and storage of rules and information about how a motor task is performed (e.g., MacMahon & Masters, 2002; Maxwell, Masters, & Eves, 2003). Limiting the role of working memory in practice has been shown to lead to development and storage of much less information, in a process described as implicit motor learning (Masters, 1992). Masters (1992) demonstrated that participants learned a golf putting skill more implicitly when they practiced while carrying out a concurrent secondary task. The task, random letter generation, was designed to use resources of working memory normally available to process hypotheses about movement solutions. Masters (1992) concluded that motor performance can improve without the accumulation of rules and information about how to perform. Consequently, Masters (1992) argued that this type of learning, implicit motor learning, promotes reduced conscious engagement in performance compared to explicit motor learning (e.g., Masters, 1992; Maxwell et al., 2003).

Masters and colleagues have since developed other implicit motor learning paradigms, such as analogy learning (Liao & Masters, 2001) and error-reduced learning (Maxwell, Masters, Kerr, & Weedon, 2001), which aim to reduce working memory activity during practice. Maxwell et al. (2001), for example, constrained the environment to reduce the amount of errors that occurred during practice, thus reducing the necessity for working memory to be engaged in hypothesis testing because performance was successful. These paradigms, however, influence working memory indirectly, so they do not unconditionally suppress the tendency that people have to use working memory to process hypotheses (e.g., Buszard, Farrow, Zhu, & Masters, 2016). Direct working memory suppression potentially overcomes this issue by blocking access to working memory resources. Zhu et al. (2015), for example, used cathodal (i.e., inhibitory) transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS) to suppress activity in the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (associated with verbal working memory) during practice of a golf putting task. Zhu et al. (2015) concluded that in comparison to sham stimulation (placebo), tDCS of the left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex suppressed verbal working memory activity, thus causing a less explicit, more implicit, mode of learning.

Cognitive fatigue potentially is also a method by which to suppress verbal working memory activity. Cognitive fatigue has been shown to reduce top-down conscious control processes (e.g., Borrigan, Slama, Destrebecqz, & Peigneux, 2016; van der Linden, 2011; van

der Linden, Frese, & Meijman, 2003; Wolfgang & Schmitt, 2009). Wolfgang and Schmitt (2009), for example, found that prolonged performance of a Stroop task (480 trials) caused cognitive fatigue, which disrupted performance. The Stroop task (Stroop, 1935) requires participants to name the colour in which colour words are written (e.g., the word ‘green’ is written in blue). Successful performance requires participants to consciously inhibit their automatic tendency to read and name the written word. Wolfgang and Schmitt (2009) argued that cognitive fatigue reduced cognitive resources available for top-down conscious inhibition of automatic responses (reading) during Stroop performance.

Borragan et al. (2016) examined the effects of cognitive fatigue on learning a serial reaction time task (SRTT). The SRTT requires participants to rapidly press buttons indicating the location of stimuli presented on a screen. Typically, participants are unaware that the order of the stimuli is repeated in a specific sequence, yet they become faster at responding and eventually anticipate accurately the position of each stimulus in the sequence. Borragan et al. (2016) found that cognitive fatigue caused by a TloadDback protocol,¹ improved learning of the sequence. They argued that during repetition of the SRTT, cognitive fatigue inhibited disruptive top-down conscious interference in the task, which was beneficial for implicit (procedural) learning. Consequently, we argued that processing task-relevant information needed for hypothesis testing is likely to be reduced if cognitive fatigue is used to suppress working memory activity prior to motor practice. Less information should, therefore, be stored during motor practice, which should result in implicit motor learning. In a pilot experiment (Hoskens, Boaz-Curry, Buszard & Masters, 2018), we first tested the veracity of the Borragan et al. (2016) protocol by employing it to fatigue participants prior to performing a golf putting task (i.e., ten trials from a distance of 300 cm). The control group watched a nature documentary prior to performing the same golf putting task. Compared to participants in the control group, participants in the fatigue group reported higher subjective feelings of cognitive fatigue, assessed using the Visual Analogue Scale of Fatigue (VASf; Lee, Hicks, & Nino-Murcia, 1990). However, participants neither displayed suppressed working memory activity²

¹ The protocol consisted of three parts: (1) a practice session of the TloadDback task (approx. duration 5 min), (2) determination of maximum cognitive load for the TloadDback task (approx. duration not reported) and (3) TloadDback task performance at individual maximum cognitive load (16 min).

² Working memory activity was measured by performance on the Reading Span Task. The Reading Span Task consisted of digits and sentences displayed on a computer monitor in an alternating sequence. Participants were required to recall the sequence of the digits at the end of each trial and to judge as fast as possible whether the sentences made sense or not (e.g., ‘*Christmas is in December*’). The number of digits (and sentences) gradually increased across blocks of trials, with each block consisting of three trials of a similar sequence length.

as a consequence of fatigue, nor did they display reduced conscious engagement³ during performance of the putting task. Based on the results of this pilot experiment, we concluded that the Borrigan et al. (2016) task may be appropriate for simple motor tasks, which rely primarily on ‘*where*’ to move (e.g., the SRTT task), but not complex motor tasks that require coordination of many degrees of freedom. Such tasks (e.g., golf putting) rely on processes of ‘*how*’ and ‘*where*’ to move. Therefore, the process of solving ‘*how*’ to move is likely to dramatically increase motivation to test hypotheses. Hence, the cognitive fatigue task developed by Borrigan et al. (2016) may not have been adequate to override motivation to test hypotheses.

Consequently, we developed a new cognitive fatigue task to better disrupt or reduce verbal-analytical engagement (and thus hypothesis testing) in more complex, goal driven sports tasks. We incorporated two important modifications. First, we designed a cognitive fatigue task with greater emphasis on motor control. Second, we focused on working memory efficiency (i.e., information processing), rather than working memory capacity. The executive functions of working memory are thought to play a major role in information processing by *updating* old information with new information, *switching* between incoming information, and *inhibiting* irrelevant incoming information (Karatekin, Lazareff, & Asarnow, 2000; Miyake et al., 2000). These processes are also predicted to play an important role in motor performance (Baumeister, Reinecke, Liesen, & Weiss, 2008; Diamond, 2000; Yogeve-Seligmann, Hausdorff, & Giladi, 2008). Therefore, our cognitive fatigue task required inhibition, switching and updating in order to catch different coloured balls in a particular sequence. Additionally, we added neural measurement to gather biological evidence of the effects of cognitive fatigue on working memory efficiency and verbal-analytical engagement in motor performance. Finally, the motor task that participants practiced when they were cognitively fatigued was designed so that we could objectively assess hypothesis testing. The experiment was conducted in two parts (A & B). First, we investigated whether working memory suppression was caused by our cognitive fatigue task and second, we asked whether this caused reduced verbal-analytical engagement and hypothesis testing when practicing a complex motor skill, compared to a non-fatigued (control) group (See Figure 1).

³ Conscious control was gauged by: (1) assessing the number of movement adjustments during golf putting (an indication of how actively participants were testing hypotheses) and (2) self-reported accounts of the amount of conscious motor processing.




Figure 1. Flow diagram of the procedure used for this study.

3 Experiment 1: Part A

In the first part of the experiment, subjective feelings of fatigue and mental effort were assessed to determine how demanding the newly designed cognitive fatigue task was. Additionally, we measured the effect of the task on the performance of computer-based tasks designed specifically to assess executive functions (inhibition, switching, and updating). Theta (4-7 Hz) power at the frontal midline (i.e., Fz region) of the brain was also measured during performance of the executive function tasks, using electroencephalography (EEG), in order to gauge the effect of cognitive fatigue on working memory activity. The frontal midline Fz site overlies the prefrontal cortex, where working memory activity is thought to occur (e.g., Imburgio & Orr, 2018; Jensen & Tesche, 2002; Klimesch, 1999; Miller & Cohen, 2001), and theta power in the Fz region (Fz theta power) is associated with working memory functions, including information maintenance and processing (Jensen & Tesche, 2002; Sauseng, Griesmayr, Freunberger, & Klimesch, 2010). Research has shown that Fz theta power increases in response to cognitive fatigue, suggesting that working memory functions are impacted negatively (Boksem, Meijman, & Lorist, 2005; e.g., Kato, Endo, & Kizuka, 2009; e.g., Wascher et al., 2014). Wascher et al. (2014), for example, revealed that theta power increased as participants became mentally fatigued during a Simon effect task (4 hours). The Simon effect task is a cognitively demanding spatial stimulus-response compatibility task, which therefore impacts working memory.

We also measured cardiac vagal control during performance of the executive function tasks by assessing heart rate variability (HRV), which is the variability in time between heartbeats (Laborde, Mosley, & Mertgen, 2018). The '*neurovisceral integration model*' (Thayer, Hansen, Saus-Rose, & Johnsen, 2009) suggests that there is a connection between the prefrontal cortex and the heart through the central autonomic network and the vagus nerve. Specifically, this model suggests that reduced prefrontal cortex activity leads to decreased cardiac vagal control. Consequently, HRV may be an indirect measure of working memory efficiency because of the association between the prefrontal cortex and working memory (Hansen, Johnsen, & Thayer, 2003; Laborde, Furley, & Schempp, 2015; Thayer et al., 2009). Hence, if cognitive fatigue suppresses working memory functions, this should be reflected by reduced cardiac vagal control (i.e., HRV) (Tanaka, Mizuno, Tajima, Sasabe, & Watanabe, 2009).

We hypothesized that the cognitive fatigue task would require considerable effort and would thus cause high perceived feelings of mental fatigue compared to a non-fatigued control group. We also expected to see decreased performance of the executive function tasks. Furthermore, in this study we predicted that cognitive fatigue would increase Fz theta power and reduce HRV during the executive function tasks compared to no cognitive fatigue.

4 Method

4.1 Participants and Design

A priori calculation using GPower 3.1.9.2 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007), based on an effect size of $\eta^2 = 0.55$ (Borrigan et al., 2016), with power set at 0.95 and alpha at 0.05, revealed a desired sample size of 48, or 24 per group. To allow for drop-out, fifty-nine people were recruited to participate in the experiment. To control for handedness,⁴ only right-handed people were included. All participants had normal/corrected vision. The participants were instructed not to consume alcohol or drugs 24 hours prior to testing or caffeine 3 hours prior to testing, and to obtain at least 6 hours of sleep the night before testing. A small incentive (10NZD) was provided for participating. A between subjects design was adopted, with participants randomly assigned to a Fatigue group (29 participants, 16 female, mean age =

⁴ Only right-handed participants were included, because hemisphere dominance is potentially influenced by handedness (e.g., Grabowska et al., 2012).

24.69 years, SD = 6.26 years)⁵ or a Non-fatigue (control) group (28 participants, 17 female, mean age = 23.50 years, SD = 5.38 years), using a random sequence generator. The study received ethical approval from the University Human Research Ethics Committee.

4.2 Treatment Task

Participants were required to complete a ball catching task on a standard table tennis table (276 x 153 x 76 cm), during which table tennis balls were projected down the centre line with a table tennis ball machine (Robo-Pong 2040, Newgy industries) starting with a frequency of approximately 23 balls/min. The balls were coloured (white, blue, black and orange) and were mixed regularly in the tray to ensure the colours were randomly dispersed. Participants were instructed to catch the balls with both hands and to place them in a container standing immediately in front of them.

4.2.1 Fatigue group

The task was performed over five levels (approximately 3 min each), which increased incrementally in difficulty. The cognitive fatigue task was designed to target the executive functions of working memory, with the following instructions:

“The ball machine will be shooting different coloured balls to you; you are required to catch the balls with both hands and to put them in the container in front of you. But, there is always one colour that you are not catching, you just let this ball go [inhibition]. During the task, I [i.e., researcher] will tell you which colour you are not catching [switching]. Each time you catch a ball call out loud the colour of the previous ball that came out of the machine [1-back, updating]. In between levels, I [i.e., researcher] will give you a starting number, and you have to count backwards in sevens from that number.”

The colour of the ball that was not to be caught switched after every ten trials during the first level of the fatigue task. During the second level, this decreased to every six trials, after which it decreased by one during each subsequent level. The number of colours also changed between levels. During the first level, the colour of the ball that was not to be caught switched between black and blue, but during the second level, the colour not to be caught switched between black, blue, and orange. During the third level, the colour of the ball not to

⁵ Participants were only included in the Fatigue group if they displayed scores indicative of cognitive fatigue following the intervention in two of the following four measures (i.e., inhibition, switching, shifting, self-reported fatigue). Based on this criterion, two participants were excluded from analysis.

be caught switched between blue, orange and white, whereas during the fourth and fifth levels, the colour not to be caught switched between all four colours (black, blue, orange, and white). To maintain fatigue, participants were required to count backwards in sevens between levels while the researcher replaced the balls in the ball machine (30 sec).

4.2.2 Non-fatigue (control) group

Participants were required to audibly identify the colour of the ball that was caught (0-back). Ball frequency was increased incrementally from approximately 23 balls/min to 37 balls/min across over levels to maintain their engagement in the task. Participants rested between levels (30 sec).

4.3 Measures – manipulation checks

4.3.1 Feelings of fatigue and mental effort

Subjective feelings of fatigue were measured with an adapted version of the Visual Analogue Scale of Fatigue (VASf, Lee, et al., 1990). The scale consists of four questions related to fatigue and attention (e.g., ‘*how tired are you at this moment?*’). Each question is rated using a Likert scale ranging from ‘*not at all*’ (1) to ‘*extremely*’ (10). The National Aeronautics and Space Administration-Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) was used to measure the amount of mental effort participants utilised while performing the fatigue and non-fatigue (control) task (Hart & Staveland, 1988; Mueller & Piper, 2014). This scale consists of six questions related to mental effort (e.g., ‘*how hurried or rushed was the pace of the task?*’). Responses were marked on a vertical line ranging from ‘*very low*’ (1) to ‘*very high*’ (21). Both scales were presented via *Psychology Experiment Building Language* (PEBL, Mueller & Piper, 2014) and the average was computed for each scale.

4.3.2 Computer-based executive function tasks

Three different computer-based executive function tasks were presented via PEBL (Mueller & Piper, 2014). Randomization of task stimuli was performed between and within participants by the PEBL software. The average duration of each task was 1 min and 40 sec.

Inhibition. The Victoria Stroop Task (Troyer, Leach, & Strauss, 2006), which is a brief version of the Stroop task (Stroop, 1935) was used to assess the ability to inhibit irrelevant stimuli. The Victoria Stroop task includes three blocks of twenty-four trials. Block 1, the *dot* block, displayed dots in different colours (see Figure 2). Block 2, the *word* block, displayed random words in different colours (e.g., car, see Figure 2). Block 3, the *interference* block, displayed

names of colours written in a different colour (e.g., yellow written in green letters, see Figure 2). Block 1 and 2 were used for familiarization, whereas Block 3 tested inhibition. Participants were required to indicate the colour of the dot or word by pressing the key representing either red, blue, green or yellow. Trials were repeated if an answer was incorrect. The Victoria Stroop task has been shown to have high test-retest reliability (Troyer et al., 2006).




Figure 2. Overview of the Victoria stoop task. The *dot*, *word* and *interference* blocks are shown from left to right.

Switching. The Plus-Minus task was used to assess the ability to switch between task requirements (Jersild, 1927; Miyake et al., 2000; Spector & Biederman, 1976). The task consisted of three blocks of ten trials. Block 1, the *addition* block required participants to add 3 to each number that was displayed, by typing it on the keyboard (see Figure 3). The next number was then displayed. Block 2, the *subtraction* block, required participants to subtract 3 from each number, and Block 3, the *switching* block, required participants to alternate between adding and subtracting 3 from the displayed number (see Figure 3). To our knowledge, test-retest has not been reported for the Plus-Minus task.




Figure 3. Overview of the Plus-Minus task. The *addition*, *subtraction* and *switching* block are shown from left to right.

Updating. The N-back task was used to assess updating abilities (Kirchner, 1958; Oberauer, 2005; Salhouse, Atkinson, & Berish, 2003). The task consisted of three blocks. For each block

a sequence of letters was displayed, with an inter-stimulus interval of 3000 msec. Block 1 required participants to remember the letter displayed one-back in the sequence, and press the shift on the keyboard when the letter they saw was the same as the previous letter. Eleven letters were presented sequentially with the same letter presented in the sequence on four random occasions. Block 2 required participants to recall the letter displayed two back in the sequence and to press the shift key when the letter two back was the same (see Figure 4 for example of 2-back updating). Twelve letters were presented sequentially with the same letter presented two back in the sequence on four random occasions. Block 1 and Block 2 were practice blocks, whereas Block 3 was a test block. Block 3 required participants to recall the letter displayed two back in the sequence and to press the shift key when the letter two back was the same. However, twenty-two letters were presented sequentially with the same letter presented two back in the sequence on six random occasions. The N-back task has adequate test-retest reliability (Soveri et al., 2018).




Figure 4. Overview of the 2-back task. An example of a letter sequence is shown, with the letter ‘K’ representing the 2-back rule.

4.3.3 EEG power

EEG was used to assess cortical activity during the computer-based executive function tasks. EEG was recorded from eight active electrodes, six of which were positioned over specific regions of the brain, using the 10-20 system (Jaspers, 1958): T7, T8, Fz, F3, FP1, Cz. Additionally, two electrodes were placed on the right and left mastoids (Neuroprene 8-electrode cap, Neuroelectronics, Barcelona, Spain). Common Mode Sense (CMS) and Driven Right Leg (DRL) electrodes were used to increase the common mode rejection ratio of the EEG signals. EEG signals were amplified and digitized at 1024 Hz, with 24-bit resolution (Neurosurfer, Neuroelectronics, Barcelona, Spain).

4.3.4 Cardiac vagal control

Cardiac vagal control during the executive function tasks was obtained by measuring heart rate (HR) activity (beats per minute, BPM), from which HRV was extrapolated. A RS800CX Polar HR monitor system was used (Polar Electro, Kempele, Finland). The system has previously been validated for measuring HR activity (Weippert et al., 2010). The signal (received from a chest strap) was stored in Polar ProTrainer 5tm software and offline cleaned and analysed with Kubios software (standard version, 3.3, Biosignal, Analysis and Medical Imaging Group, University of Kuopio, Finland, developed in Matlab 2012a; Tarvainen, Niskanen, Lipponen, Ranta-Aho, & Karjalainen, 2014).

4.4 Procedure

Participants were informed about the context of the study and signed an informed consent form before providing general demographics prior to the start of the experiment. An EEG cap and HR monitor band were fitted and a 4 min EEG and HR resting state assessment was performed (2 min with closed eyes and 2 min with open eyes). Detailed instructions about each task in the experiment were provided in order to minimize explanation time between tasks. Participants completed the VASf scale and the three computer-based executive function tasks (Victoria Stroop, Plus-Minus, and N-back) pre-fatigue and post-fatigue (or control). The NASA-TLX was completed post-fatigue (or control) task. The task (fatigue or non-fatigue) was performed at five levels (total duration around 15 min). To ensure that participants remained engaged in the task, they were informed that it was important to complete all five levels in order to proceed to the next part of the experiment (i.e., Experiment 1: Part B).

4.5 Data analyses

4.5.1 Computer-based executive function tasks

Inhibition. Performance was determined by the amount of responses made to successfully complete the Victoria Stroop task (score) and task duration for each of the three task conditions (*dot*, *word*, *interference*).⁶ The inhibition-cost for the *interference* block was computed by relating the amount of trials ($\text{inhibition-cost}_{\text{score}}$) and duration time ($\text{inhibition-cost}_{\text{duration}}$) of the *interference* block with the *dot* block and the *word* block:

⁶ Non-native English speakers (N = 8) were excluded from this analysis because their performance on an English version Stroop task may not have accurately represented their inhibition ability (Rosselli et al., 2002).

331
$$\text{Inhibition-cost} = \text{interference block} - \frac{(\text{dot block} * \text{word block})}{(\text{dot block} + \text{word block})}$$

332 The inhibition costs were computed to control for any gross psychomotor speed (Strickland,
333 D'Elia, James, & Stein, 1997). A higher score indicates worse performance on the interference
334 block (Strickland et al., 1997).

335 **Switching.** Performance was determined by the number of correct answers (i.e., score),
336 completion time and median reaction time (RT) for the three different blocks in the Plus-Minus
337 task.⁷ The switching-costs were computed by relating the score of the *switching* block with the
338 average of the *adding* and *subtracting* blocks, separately for number of correct answers
339 (switching-cost_{score}), RT (switching-cost_{RT}) and completion time (switching-cost_{duration})
340 (Miyake et al., 2000):

341
$$\text{Switching-cost} = \text{switching block} - \frac{\text{addition block} + \text{subtraction block}}{2}$$

342 The switching-costs were computed to control for any overall difficulties with mathematical
343 performance (Miyake et al., 2000). However, the switching-cost_{score} entails an opposite
344 interpretation from the switching-cost_{duration} and switching-cost_{RT}. A higher switching-cost_{score}
345 means more correct answers for the switching block compared to the other two blocks (addition
346 and subtraction), whereas higher switching-cost_{duration} and switching-cost_{RT}, means longer
347 response time for the switching block compared to the other two blocks.

348 **Updating.** Performance was determined by calculating the number of correct responses,⁸
349 together with RT on the correct target letter trials (i.e., when response is required) on the N-
350 back task.

351 **4.5.2 EEG power**

352 EEG signals captured during performance of the executive function tests were processed
353 offline using EEGLab software (version 14, Delorme & Makeig, 2004), running on Matlab
354 software (MathWorks, Inc., USA version 2018b). The data was resampled to 250 Hz and band
355 pass filtered (1-35Hz band pass filter), re-referenced to the average of the two mastoids and
356 de-trended. Baseline correction (200ms before time of interest) was completed and

⁷ Participants unable to achieve more than five correct answers in either addition or subtraction block during the pre-test were excluded (N = 1).

⁸ The score was taken from all trials, including the correct response to non-target letters (not responding) and target letters (responding). This was done, because otherwise, performance would only be computed from six trials.

electromyography (EMG) and electrooculography (EOG) artefacts were removed using Blind Source Separation (AAR plug in; Gomez-Herrero et al., 2006), and Least Mean Squares regression (Gomez-Herrero et al., 2006; Haykin, 1996). The signals were bundled into epochs and then subjected to a threshold-based artefact removal procedure, where any 250 msec window containing signal fluctuations exceeding $\pm 75 \mu\text{V}$ was rejected.

The clean signal was subjected to time frequency analysis to obtain the estimated instantaneous theta power for 28 sec (the maximum duration after artefact removal) of each of the three executive function tasks. This analysis was performed by convolving the fast Fourier transform (FFT) power spectrum of the signal with a family of complex Morlet wavelets and eventually taking the inverse FFT (Cohen, 2014). Power at each frequency bin was defined as the squared magnitude of the results of the convolution and averaged across the theta (4-7 Hz) frequency band. To ensure normal distribution, all power estimates were subjected to a logarithmic (\log_{10}) transformation prior to statistical analysis.

4.5.3 Cardiac vagal control

The HRV (measure of cardiac vagal control) was obtained from the HR activity during the executive function tasks (3 min and 30 sec in total). Artefacts were filtered out using the automatic medium filter. Thereafter, high frequency (HF-HRV) power (0.15-0.4 Hz) in msec was obtained using fast Fourier transform (Tarvainen et al., 2014), which was then subjected to logarithmic (\log_{10}) transformation. *Reactivity* measures of HF-HRV (pre-test and post-test) were determined by calculating the differences between the HRV during the baseline and executive function task performance (Laborde et al., 2018; Laborde, Mosley, & Thayer, 2017).

4.5.4 Statistical approach

VASf scores were subjected to a 2 x 3 repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA): Group (Fatigue, Non-fatigue) x Test (Baseline, Pre-, Post-). Performance, theta power and *reactivity* HF-HRV during the executive function tasks were all subjected to 2 x 2 repeated measure analyses of variance (ANOVA): Group (Fatigue, Non-fatigue) x Test (Pre-, Post-). An independent t-test was used to compare between group scores on the NASA-TLX scale.

Sphericity and normality checks were performed, and controlled for when needed. When main effects or interactions were found, separate ANOVAs were conducted and post-hoc tests were Bonferroni corrected. Effect sizes are reported as partial η squared (η_p^2), with the values .01, .06, and .14 indicating relatively small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1988). Cohen's *d* effect size is reported for the independent t-test, with the values 0.2,

0.5 and 0.8 indicating relatively small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1988). The statistical tests were performed using SPSS (IBM, version 25.0) computer software. Significance was set at $p = .05$ for all statistical tests.

5 Results

5.1 Feelings of fatigue

For VASf, a main effect of Group was not evident, $F(1,51) = 2.88$, $p = .096$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$, but a main effect of Test was evident, $F(1.75,89.34) = 12.42$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .20$. Post-hoc analysis revealed higher scores for the post-test compared to both the baseline ($p < .010$) and the pre-test ($p < .001$), which did not differ ($p = 1.00$). Further insight into the Test effect was revealed by a Group x Test interaction, $F(2,102) = 3.41$, $p = .037$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$ (see Figure 5). Follow-up repeated measures ANOVAs for each group separately, revealed no differences across Test in the non-fatigued (control) group, $F(2,50) = 1.92$, $p = .157$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, but significant differences were evident in the fatigued group, $F(1.54,40.03) = 12.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .33$. Post-hoc analysis showed that scores in the fatigued group were significantly higher in the post-test compared to both the baseline ($p < .010$) and pre-test ($p < .001$), which did not differ ($p = .427$).




Figure 5. Mean score on the Visual Analog scale of Fatigue (VASf) for each group at baseline, pre-test and post-test. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. $*p < .05$, $**p < .001$.

5.2 Mental effort

Score on the NASA-TLX (administered at post-test) was significantly higher in the fatigued group (Mean = 76.97, SD = 13.18) compared to the non-fatigued (control) group (Mean = 53.75, SD = 23.84), $t(41.79) = 4.53$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.21$.

5.3 Executive functions

5.3.1 Inhibition

For the Stroop task inhibition-cost_{score} (see formula in Method),⁹ neither a main effect of Group, $F(1,46) = 0.04$, $p = .840$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$, nor of Test, $F(1,46) = 1.12$, $p = .295$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, was revealed. A Group x Test interaction was evident, $F(1,46) = 4.13$, $p = .048$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$ (see Figure 3.6). Separate post-hoc tests for each group revealed that inhibition-cost_{score} was significantly lower (i.e., better performance) in the non-fatigued (control) group during the post-test compared to the pre-test ($p = .032$), but not in the fatigued group ($p = .506$).

For the inhibition-cost_{duration}, neither a main effect of Group, $F(1,44) = 0.73$, $p = .398$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, nor of Test, $F(1,44) = 1.98$, $p = .167$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, was revealed. A Group x Test interaction was not evident, $F(1,44) = 0.53$, $p = .469$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.¹⁰




Figure 6. Inhibition-cost_{score} for the Stroop task for each group at pre-test and post-test. The higher the inhibition-cost_{score} the higher the number of attempts needed to complete the

⁹ Logarithmic (log10) transformation was performed to control for skewness (Troyer et al., 2006).

¹⁰ See Table 1 in Appendix for all mean and SD values for non-significant results.

interference block (i.e., worse performance). Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

* $p < .05$.

5.3.2 Switching

For Plus-Minus switching-cost_{score} (see formula in Method),¹¹ neither a main effect of Group, $F(1,53) = 2.96, p = .091, \eta_p^2 = .05$, nor of Test, $F(1,53) = 3.11, p = .083, \eta_p^2 = .06$, was found. However, a Group x Test interaction was evident, $F(1,53) = 4.73, p = .034, \eta_p^2 = .08$ (see Figure 7). Post-hoc analysis for each group revealed that the switching-cost_{score} was significantly lower (i.e., better performance) in the non-fatigued (control) group during the post-test compared to the pre-test, ($p = .010$) but not in the fatigued group ($p = .773$).




Figure 7. Switching-cost_{score} for the Plus-Minus task for each group at pre-test and post-test.

The higher the switching-cost_{RT} the higher the median RT for the switching block, compared to the addition and subtraction blocks. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. * $p < .05$.

For the Plus-Minus switching-cost_{duration}, significant main effects were not found for Group, $F(1,52) = 0.13, p = .717, \eta_p^2 < .01$, or for Test, $F(1,52) = 0.14, p = .713, \eta_p^2 < .01$, and there was no Group x Test interaction, $F(1,52) = 2.19, p = .145, \eta_p^2 = .04$.

For the Plus-Minus switching-cost_{RT}, neither a main effect of Group, $F(1,51) = 0.70, p = .407, \eta_p^2 = .01$, nor of Test, $F(1,51) = 1.47, p = .232, \eta_p^2 = .03$, was evident. However, there

¹¹ Logarithmic (log10) transformation was performed to control for skewness (Templeton, 2011).

was a Group x Test interaction, $F(1,51) = 4.37, p = .041, \eta_p^2 = .08$ (see Figure 8). Separate post-hoc tests for each group revealed that switching-cost_{RT} was significantly lower (i.e., better performance) in the non-fatigued (control) group during the post-test compared to the pre-test ($p = .036$), but not in the fatigued group ($p = .511$).




Figure 8. Switching-cost_{RT} for the Plus-Minus task for each group at pre-test and post-test. The higher the switching-cost_{RT} the higher the median RT for the switching block, compared to the addition and subtraction blocks. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. * $p < .05$.

5.3.3 Updating

For the N-back scores,¹² main effects were not evident for Group, $F(1,39) = 1.84, p = .183, \eta_p^2 = .05$, or for Test, $F(1,39) = 2.56, p = .118, \eta_p^2 = .06$. An interaction was not present, $F(1,39) = 0.05, p = .824, \eta_p^2 < .01$.

For RTs, main effects were not evident for Group, $F(1,39) = 2.62, p = .114, \eta_p^2 = .06$, or for Test, $F(1,39) = 0.77, p = .387, \eta_p^2 = .02$. An interaction was not present, $F(1,39) = 0.07, p = .792, \eta_p^2 < .01$.

¹² Logarithmic (log₁₀) transformation was performed to control for skewness (Engelhardt, Harden, Tucker-Drob, & Church, 2019).

5.4 EEG power

5.4.1 Inhibition

For EEG theta power in the Fz region during the Stroop task, main effects were not found for Group, $F(1,27) = 0.41$, $p = .529$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, or for Test, $F(1,27) = 0.51$, $p = .482$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. However, a Group x Test interaction was present, $F(1,27) = 6.51$, $p = .017$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$ (see Figure 9). Separate post-hoc tests for each group revealed that theta power was significantly lower during the post-test compared to the pre-test in the non-fatigued (control) group ($p = .045$), but not in the fatigued group ($p = .188$).




Figure 9. Mean theta (4-7 Hz) power for each group during the Stroop task at pre-test and post-test. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. $*p < .05$.

5.4.2 Switching

Neither a main effect of Group, $F(1,29) = 1.32$, $p = .260$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, nor of Test, $F(1,29) = 1.02$, $p = .321$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, was evident for Fz theta power during the Plus-Minus task. A Group x Test interaction was not evident, $F(1,29) = 0.03$, $p = .856$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$.

5.4.3 Updating

No main effect of Group, $F(1,26) = 0.23$, $p = .638$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, or of Test, $F(1,26) = 0.01$, $p = .927$, $\eta_p^2 < .001$, was evident for the Fz theta power during the N-back task, and a Group x Test interaction was not found, $F(1,26) = 1.88$, $p = .183$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$.

5.5 Cardiac vagal control

The *reactivity* HF-HRV measure revealed no main effects for Group, $F(1,45) = 2.08$, $p = .157$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, or Test, $F(1,45) = 0.52$, $p = .475$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. A Group x Test interaction was not present, $F(1,45) = 0.01$, $p = .931$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$.

6 Discussion

The cognitive fatigue task caused increased feelings of fatigue and greater mental effort was reported by participants in the cognitive fatigue treatment than participants in the control treatment. With respect to executive functions of working memory, both inhibition and switching performance improved significantly from pre-test to post-test in the non-fatigued (control) group, suggesting that a learning effect occurred. No such improvements occurred in the fatigued group, so the cognitive fatigue task may have interfered with both inhibition and switching, as hypothesised. Updating, as represented by performance on the N-back task, showed no differential effects between the two groups, suggesting that updating was unaffected by the cognitive fatigue task in this experiment. Previous studies suggest that the updating function relies on different cognitive processes compared to inhibition and switching functions (Imburgio & Orr, 2018; St Clair-Thompson, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015). Zhang et al. (2015), for example, suggested that the inhibition and switching functions are related to cognitive flexibility, whereas updating is related to cognitive stability. Cognitive stability is thought to reflect goal maintenance, while cognitive flexibility reflects the ability to adapt to the environment (Frober, Raith, & Dreisbach, 2018). However, previous studies suggest that cognitive flexibility (i.e., inhibition and switching) is important for verbal-analytical processes, associated with hypothesis testing, such as movement specific reinvestment (Park et al., 2020) and rumination (Yang, Cao, Shields, Teng, & Liu, 2017).¹³

We predicted that Fz theta power during the executive function tasks would increase from pre-test to post-test in the cognitively fatigued group compared to the non-fatigued (control) group. Fz theta power was not significantly different between groups during switching or updating, but during the inhibition task, a group by test interaction was evident. Theta power increased from pre-test to post-test among participants in the fatigued group (although not significantly). However, theta power decreased significantly from pre-test to post-test in the non-fatigued (control) group. There is debate regarding how changes in Fz theta

¹³ Movement specific reinvestment requires the flexibility to consciously manipulate explicit knowledge to control movements (Masters & Maxwell, 2008). Rumination (or rehearsal), presumably is important for refining movements (e.g., Masters et al., 1993).

power during cognitive tasks should be interpreted, with some studies claiming that changes in theta power may be associated with engagement in the task, and others claiming that changes may be associated with recruitment of mental resources (see Wascher et al., 2014, for a discussion on this). Decreased Fz theta power at post-test in the non-fatigued group implies that participants recruited fewer mental resources during the executive function tasks, perhaps because of familiarity or learning effects. Participants in the non-fatigued (control) group displayed improved performance of the executive functions tasks in the post-test, which supports this possibility. Additionally, previous research has shown that good cognitive performance is associated with reduced Fz theta power (Klimesch, 1999). In contrast, higher Fz theta power for the inhibition task at post-test in the cognitively fatigued group may indicate that participants recruited additional mental resources to compensate for the effects of fatigue on the executive functions of working memory. This explanation is supported by the fact that participants displayed stable performance of the executive function tasks when they were fatigued (i.e., post-test).

HRV was used as an indirect measure of working memory activity based on the neurovisceral integration model (Hansen et al., 2003; Thayer et al., 2009). We expected HRV to be lower during the executive function tasks post-fatigue compared to pre-fatigue, and compared to no fatigue (control). However, no significant effects were found. Recent studies have reported that HRV responses can differ as a function of specific executive functions (Jennings, Allen, Gianaros, Thayer, & Manuck, 2015; Kimhy et al., 2013; Laborde et al., 2018), so it would be of interest to examine HRV during specific executive function in future studies.¹⁴

Based on the findings, we concluded that the motor specific cognitive fatigue task that we developed has potential to suppress working memory activity and, therefore, disrupt or reduce verbal-analytical engagement (and thus hypothesis testing) in more complex, goal driven movements, such as those employed during sports.

7 Experiment 1: Part B

Having established some evidence for the efficacy of our cognitive fatigue task by revealing increased feelings of fatigue and moderation of executive functions, we therefore investigated whether the intervention caused reduced hypothesis testing during practice of an adapted shuffleboard task. The task required participants to use a paddle to slide a disk to a given target.

¹⁴ We were unable to analyse HRV separately for inhibition, switching and updating because the task durations were too short brief for reliable analysis (average duration 1 min and 40 sec) (Laborde et al., 2017).

The contours of the paddle were shaped to allow participants to use many different solutions for the task. Behavioural and psychophysiological measures were obtained to determine the extent of hypothesis testing. The behavioural measures consisted of self-ratings of technique (Maxwell et al., 2001; Maxwell, Masters, & Poolton, 2006), number of paddle solutions and number of technique changes (Maxwell et al., 2001).

The psychophysiological measures consisted of two cortical measures of high-alpha EEG power over the left temporal (T7) region and connectivity between T7 and the mid-frontal (Fz) regions, to examine verbal-analytical engagement during movement, which we predicted to be associated with hypothesis testing (Maxwell et al., 2001).

The T7 region place an important role in processing verbal-analytical knowledge (Kaufer & Lewis, 1999; Sperry, 1974), and neural activation of the T7 area has been used to indirectly gauge verbal-analytical processes during motor task performance (Hatfield, Landers, & Ray, 1984; Haufler, Spalding, Santa Maria, & Hatfield, 2000; Kerick et al., 2001; van Duijn, Hoskens, & Masters, 2019). Specifically, these studies have revealed that increased high alpha power (10-12 Hz)¹⁵ over the T7 region during motor planning is associated with lower levels of verbal-analytical processes (Hatfield et al., 1984; Haufler et al., 2000; Kerick et al., 2001; van Duijn et al., 2019).

The Fz region is near the motor areas deputed to motor planning (Cooke et al., 2015; Shibasaki & Hallett, 2006). Based on this, previous studies have computed connectivity between the T7 and Fz regions (i.e., high-alpha T7-Fz connectivity) to measure the extent of verbal-analytical engagement in motor planning (Cooke, 2013; Gallicchio, Cooke, & Ring, 2016; Hatfield & Hillman, 2001; Zhu, Poolton, Wilson, Maxwell, & Masters, 2011). Zhu et al. (2011), for example, revealed that during movement preparation (4 sec before movement initiation) participants with a lower propensity to consciously control their movements¹⁶ displayed lower T7-Fz connectivity compared to participants with a higher propensity to consciously control their movements. Based on this evidence, T7 power and T7-Fz connectivity are potentially valuable markers of the effect of cognitive fatigue on hypothesis testing in a motor task (see Cooke, 2013; Hatfield & Hillman, 2001, for reviews).

¹⁵ High-alpha power is inversely related to neural activity (e.g., Gallicchio, Cooke, & Ring, 2017; Klimesch, 1999).

¹⁶ Conscious control was measured by the Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale (Masters, Eves, & Maxwell, 2005; Masters & Maxwell, 2008).

We hypothesized that the cognitive fatigue task would suppress the inhibition and switching functions of working memory during the adapted shuffleboard task, compared with the non-fatigued (control) group, thus interfering with the ability to test hypotheses about performance. Consequently, we expected that in the cognitively fatigued group participants would self-report fewer technique changes, test fewer paddle solutions and display fewer technique changes than participants in the non-fatigued (control) group. They were also expected to display lower levels of T7-Fz connectivity and higher high alpha T7 power.

8 Method

8.1 Participants and Design

See Participants and Design, Experiment 1: Part A. Participants who completed the fatigue or non-fatigue (control) treatment in Part A remained in the laboratory and immediately completed the adapted shuffleboard task.

8.2 Shuffleboard Task

Immediately after the cognitive fatigue/control protocol, participants were required to use a wooden paddle (see Figure 10) to practice shuffling a wooden disk (1.3 cm thick, diameter 5.2 cm) to a target circle (diameter 10 cm) on a smooth board, which extended lengthways from the participant (120 x 360 cm). The contours of the paddle were shaped inconsistently to provide participants many different methods by which to direct the disk to the target. The number of different methods used was adopted as an objective measure of hypothesis testing. The target was projected onto the board by an overhead projector and a camera above the target captured the outcome position of the wooden disk after each trial. A video camera was used to capture the movements of the participant during each trial.



Figure 10. Shuffleboard disk and paddle

8.3 Measures

8.3.1 Shuffleboard task

Radial error (cm) was obtained as a performance measure. Radial error represented the distance between the final position of the disk and the centre of the target. *ScorePutting* software (written in National Instruments LabVIEW) was used to compute the radial error from a photograph taken with a camera that was placed directly above the target (Neumann & Thomas, 2008).

8.3.2 Behavioural measures of hypothesis testing

Participants were asked to rate how motivated they were to perform the shuffleboard task (scale 1–10), in order to control for potential influences of motivation on task performance (Boksem, Meijman, & Lorist, 2006). No significant differences in motivation were revealed between Groups, $t(53) = -1.295$, $p = .201$, $d = 0.35$.

Self-reported technique changes were conducted by asking the participants to rate how often they changed their technique during each block of twenty trials (scale 1–10). Additionally, two researchers blinded to treatment group independently viewed the video data and counted the number of paddle solutions and the number of changes in technique during each block of trials. Paddle solutions were defined as the different ways in which the paddle was used (see Figure 10), and changes in technique were defined as the different ways in which the paddle was moved. A high degree of correlation was evident between the scores of the two researchers for both measures - $ICC_{\text{average measures stick}} = 0.80$, 95% confidence interval 0.29-0.94, $F(11,11) = 4.92$, $p = .007$ and $ICC_{\text{average measures technique}} = 0.86$, 95% confidence interval 0.33-0.94, $F(11,11) = 5.16$, $p = .006$ (Hallgren, 2012).

8.3.3 Psychophysiological measures of hypothesis testing

EEG data was examined during the motor preparation phase of each trial of the shuffleboard task. The EEG data was obtained and processed using the same protocol as in Experiment 1: Part A (see Methods). Participants rested their head on a chin rest prior to each trial and were asked to only focus on the target (to reduce eye movements). They were instructed to remain as still as possible during when performing the task. Participants started preparing the movement when the disk was placed in front of them and initiated their movement when the target appeared on the board. EEG activity was determined for the high alpha frequency band (10-12 Hz), as this frequency is associated with global cortico-communication (Klimesch, 1999).

8.4 Procedure

Participants rated their motivation before starting the shuffleboard task, which consisted of three blocks of 20 shuffleboard trials (each block took an average of 6 min and 40 sec to complete). Participants were instructed to slide the disk onto the target as accurately as possible and to initiate their movement when the target appeared on the table. The position of the disk was recorded by photograph after each trial. The target then disappeared and the researcher collected the disk and presented it for the next trial. This was done to standardise the inter-trial interval and to reduce the need for participants to move between trials. When the final block of practice trials was completed, participants completed a self-report rating of the number of technique changes they had made in each block of trials.

8.5 Data analysis

8.5.1 EEG connectivity and power measures

The EEG data was analysed by first generating epochs consisting of 5 sec prior until 2 sec after the target appeared (i.e., movement initiation) for each trial. Thereafter, the same filtering and cleaning procedures employed in Part A were applied to the epochs (see Experiment 1: Part A, Methodology, for more details). A threshold-based artefact removal procedure was performed, deleting epochs with values $\pm 75 \mu\text{V}$ to clean the signal (Deeny, Hillman, Janelle, & Hatfield, 2003). Exclusion of participants from further analysis occurred if too many epochs (more than 25%) had to be deleted.¹⁷ The alpha frequency band (8-12 Hz) was adjusted for each participant based on their individual alpha frequency (IAF) peak, determined from the baseline measure described in Experiment 1: Part A (IAF toolbox, Corcoran, Alday, Schlesewsky, & Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, 2018). The clean signal was then subjected to time frequency analysis to obtain estimated instantaneous high alpha frequency power for 3 sec prior to movement initiation.

Phase angles were also obtained from the time frequency analysis and were used to compute inter-site phase clustering connectivity (ISPC, Cohen, 2014) between the left temporal (T7) and frontal (Fz) regions in the high alpha frequency band for the 3 sec prior to movement initiation. We calculated the $\text{ISPC}_{\text{trial}}$ using the following function:

$$\text{ISPC}_{xy}(f) = \left| n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n e^{i(\theta_x(tf) - \theta_y(tf))} \right|$$

¹⁷ Due to technical issues with the EEG equipment, twenty-one participants had to be excluded from this analysis (19 participants were retained in each group).

N is the number of data points, i is the imaginary operator, θ_x and θ_y are the phase angles of the recorded signal at two different scalp locations, t is the trial and f is the frequency bin. The $e^{i(\theta_x(tf) - \theta_y(tf))}$ represents the complex vector with magnitude 1 and angle $\theta_x - \theta_y$, $n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n (\cdot)$ denotes averaging over time points, and $|\cdot|$ is the module of the averaged vector (Cohen, 2014; Lachaux, Rodriguez, Martinerie, & Varela, 1999). ISPC is assigned as a value between 0 (no functional connection) and 1 (perfect functional connection). Finally, a Z-transformed (inverse hyperbolic tangent) was performed to ensure normal distribution (e.g., Gallicchio et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2011).

8.5.2 Statistical approach

All measures were subjected to a 2 x 3 repeated measures ANOVA Group (Fatigue, Non-fatigue) x Block (Block 1, Block 2, Block 3). Sphericity and normality checks were performed and controlled for when necessary. Separate ANOVAs with Bonferroni corrections were performed when main effects or interactions were found. Effect sizes are reported as partial η squared (η_p^2), with the values .01, .06 and .14 indicating relatively small, medium and large effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1988). The statistical tests were performed using SPSS (IBM, version 25.0) computer software. Significance was set at $p = .05$ for all statistical tests.

9 Results

9.1 Behavioural measures of hypothesis testing

9.1.1 Self-reported technique changes

No main effect was found for Group, $F(1,55) = 0.26$, $p = .610$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, but there was a main effect for Block, $F(1.47,81.03) = 26.33$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .32$ (see Figure 11). Post-hoc analysis revealed that participants reported that they made more changes in Block 1 compared to Block 2 ($p = .003$) and Block 3 ($p < .001$), with more changes in Block 2 than Block 3 ($p < .001$). A Group x Block interaction was not present, $F(2,110) = 0.01$, $p = .988$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$.




Figure 11. Mean score on the self-report of technique change for each group by block of trials. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

9.1.2 Number of paddle solutions

A main effect was not present for Group, $F(1,52) = 0.13$, $p = .717$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$, but an effect was present for Block, $F(1.79,92.79) = 37.07$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .42$ (see Figure 12). Post-hoc analysis revealed that participants used significantly more solutions in Block 1 compared to Block 2 ($p < .001$) and Block 3 ($p < .001$), and more solutions in Block 2 than Block 3 ($p = .005$). A Group x Block interaction was not present, $F(2,104) = 0.05$, $p = .953$, $\eta_p^2 < .01$.




Figure 12. Mean number of paddle solutions for each group by block of trials. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

9.1.3 Technique changes

A main effect of Group was evident, $F(1,51) = 4.69$, $p = .035$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$ (see Figure 13), indicating significantly more technique changes in the fatigued group than the non-fatigued (control) group over the three blocks of trials. A main effect was also evident for Block, $F(1.67,85.05) = 25.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .33$, with post-hoc analysis revealing a significantly higher number of technique changes in Block 1 compared to Block 2 ($p < .001$) and Block 3 ($p < .001$). Block 2 and Block 3 were not significantly different ($p = 1.00$). An interaction between Group and Block was absent, $F(2,102) = 0.55$, $p = .580$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.




Figure 13. Mean number of technique changes for each group by block of trials. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

9.2 Psychophysiological measures of hypothesis testing

9.2.1 T7-Fz connectivity

A main effect was found for Group, $F(1,32) = 5.83$, $p = .022$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$ (see Figure 14), indicating significantly higher T7-Fz connectivity in the fatigued group than the non-fatigued (control) group over the three blocks of trials. Neither a main effect of Block, $F(2,64) = 1.18$, $p = .315$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, nor a Group x Block interaction, $F(2,64) = 1.09$, $p = .344$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, were present.




Figure 14. Mean ISPCtrials connectivity for each group by block of trials. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

9.2.2 T7 high alpha power

Main effects were not present for Group, $F(1,32) = 0.70$, $p = .408$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, or for Block, $F(2,64) = 1.78$, $p = .177$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. A Group x Block interaction was not present, $F(2,64) = 1.99$, $p = .145$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$ (see Table 2 in Appendix for mean and SD values).

9.3 Shuffleboard performance

A main effect of Group was not evident for radial error, $F(1,50) = 3.53$, $p = .066$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. A main effect of Block was evident, $F(1.81,90.52) = 79.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .61$ (see Figure 15). Radial error was significantly higher in Block 1 compared to Block 2 ($p < .001$) and Block 3 ($p < .001$), and higher in Block 2 compared to Block 3 ($p = .002$). A significant interaction was not revealed, $F(2,100) = 1.08$, $p = .344$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$.




Figure 15. Mean radial error (cm) for each group by block of trials. Error bars represent standard error of the mean.

10 Discussion

Behavioural measures of hypothesis testing suggested that participants tested more hypotheses in the first block of the shuffleboard task compared with the later blocks. This is consistent with traditional views of learning (e.g., Fitts & Posner, 1967), which suggest that as learning progresses processing of performance becomes less cognitive.

We found no between-group differences in self-reported changes in technique or in the number of paddle solutions that participants used, although more technique changes occurred in the fatigued group. It is possible that participants were unaware of the way in which they altered their kinematics during performance and thus under-reported their technique changes. Furthermore, it has been argued that the assessment of declarative knowledge via self-report should consist of a qualitative analysis of the information produced by the participants, rather than by a simple Likert scale as used in this study (Shanks & John, 1994). It is also possible that participants did not use many different paddle solutions, but instead chose to alter their technique by leveraging the degrees of freedom made available by the human motor apparatus (Bernstein, 1996).

The technique changes, however, suggest that the cognitive fatigue task did not suppress hypothesis testing; in fact, hypothesis testing increased. Consistent with this finding, high alpha power for the T7 region was not significantly different between the fatigued and non-fatigued group, suggesting that verbal-analytical activity in general (e.g., self-talk) was the same, but verbal-analytical engagement in motor performance (i.e., increased high alpha T7-Fz

connectivity) was significantly higher in the fatigued group across all shuffleboard blocks. Performance accuracy (radial error) improved during practice, but was not different between groups.

A limitation of the experiment is that we did not include a shuffleboard baseline measure and, therefore, we cannot fully discount the possibility that increased verbal-analytical engagement in the fatigued group might have been a result of the shuffleboard skill level of the participants. However, a baseline shuffleboard task would have provided an opportunity to accumulate explicit knowledge about the task, which would have confounded our measures of hypothesis testing. Furthermore, we cannot preclude the possibility that the effects of cognitive fatigue dissipated over time. Future studies should, therefore, include a measure of fatigue during the shuffleboard task to establish whether fatigue remained for the total duration of the 60 trials.

In contrast to our expectations, participants in the fatigued group did not appear to perform the shuffleboard task with reduced verbal-analytical engagement or demonstrate less hypothesis testing; in fact, they displayed more technique changes (indicative of testing more hypotheses) and showed higher levels of verbal-analytical engagement in the motor task compared to non-fatigued participants.

11 General Discussion

Implicit approaches to motor learning argue that explicit (i.e., verbal-analytical) control of movement can disrupt procedural (i.e., automatized) control of motor performance. Implicit motor learning paradigms (e.g., Masters, 1992), therefore, seek to promote procedural control of movement by reducing hypothesis testing during learning. In pilot work (Hoskens et al., 2018), we found that a computer-based cognitive fatigue task developed by Borrigan et al. (2016) did not deplete cognitive resources needed for hypothesis testing during complex movements. We concluded that the cognitive fatigue task that Borrigan et al. (2016) employed was not sufficiently mentally demanding to reduce verbal-analytical engagement when learning complex motor skills. We suggested that a more movement-specific cognitive fatigue task should be developed. Based on our pilot work, we designed a cognitive fatigue task that was motor focused and which challenged information processing (i.e., executive functions of working memory).

In Part A of the experiment, we found that participants in the cognitively fatigued group reported feelings of greater fatigue and mental effort compared to participants in the non-

fatigued (control) group. These effects were revealed after performance of a relatively short treatment task (i.e., 15 min). This study is, therefore, consistent with other recently developed short duration cognitive fatigue paradigms (e.g., Borrigan et al., 2019; O’Keeffe, Hodder, & Lloyd, 2020; Trejo et al., 2015), suggesting that cognitive fatigue can be achieved effectively by performing brief, mentally demanding tasks. Of the three executive functions of working memory, the inhibition and switching functions were disrupted by the cognitive fatigue task, but the updating function was not. Differences in Fz theta power (i.e., prefrontal cortex activity) were only found during inhibition. Nevertheless, previous studies have argued that inhibition and switching are most important for hypothesis testing (Park et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2017), so we concluded that the motor specific cognitive fatigue task had potential to reduce verbal-analytical engagement in motor performance and thus had potential to create conditions for implicit motor learning by suppressing executive functions associated with hypothesis testing.

Subsequently, the second part of the study examined whether the motor specific cognitive fatigue task, indeed, suppressed hypothesis testing during practice of a novel motor skill. However, in contrast to our expectations, a higher number of changes in technique occurred in the fatigued group compared to the non-fatigued (control) group during practice of the shuffleboard task. Technique changes are thought to reflect hypothesis testing, with performers altering their movements in order to become more successful at the task. Consistent with this, participants in the fatigued group also displayed greater verbal-analytical engagement in motor planning (T7-Fz connectivity) (e.g., Cooke et al., 2015; Kerick et al., 2001; Zhu et al., 2011). These findings suggest that the cognitive fatigue task may have primed the performer to use more cognitive resources during motor performance to compensate for the side effects of fatigue. However, fatigue might have also resulted in disrupted executive functions, causing reduced ability to *inhibit* processing irrelevant information and inefficient *switching* between incoming information. Lorist et al. (2009) found that cognitive fatigue disrupted efficient activation of the areas of the brain that were crucial for effective performance by causing increased neural activity across the whole brain (i.e., reduced interhemispheric inhibition). Consequently, by increasing compensatory effort into motor planning (e.g., trying harder), participants in our study may have inadvertently diverted resources away from critical cortical regions. This may have disrupted efficient processing of information (disrupted inhibition and switching). These findings have their parallels in Attentional Control Theory (ACT, Eysenck et al., 2007), which seeks to explain the effects of anxiety on performance. Possibly, fatigue acts in a similar fashion to anxiety by raising concerns about maintaining effective

performance. ACT theory argues that such concerns disrupt processing efficiency, especially with respect to inhibition and switching (as we found). However, individuals can compensate for the negative effects of such disruptions by increasing mental effort. Eysenck et al. (2007) claimed that mental effort is deployed to inhibit stimulus driven, bottom-up responses by replacing them with goal-driven, top-down processes. Participants in our study may have used explicit hypothesis testing to maintain goal-driven, top-down behaviour (see for example, Nieuwenhuys & Oudejans, 2012).

Given that Zhu et al. (2015) did claim to have caused implicit motor learning by using tDCS to suppress activity in the prefrontal cortex (i.e., associated with working memory), it is possible that our motor focused cognitive fatigue protocol was not sufficiently stringent to completely suppress working memory functions. Future studies should utilize more stringent methods to suppress working memory activity prior to motor practice. Hypoxia, for example, has been revealed to reduce available cognitive resources because the body prioritizes support for the cardiac system in reduced oxygen environments (McMorris, Hale, Barwood, Costello, & Corbett, 2017; Yan, Zhang, Gong, & Weng, 2011).

Altogether, the results of our study do give insight into how cognitively demanding tasks affect cognitive processes during both computer-based executive function tasks and relatively complex motor tasks. Cognitively fatiguing motor control, using tasks such as ours, may not be desirable if it primes greater verbal-analytical processing of motor skills in novices. However, such an approach may be desirable if it primes greater verbal-analytical processing in experts who are refining their skills (e.g., Toner & Moran, 2014, 2015), or in tasks where successful performance is a function of both motor and cognitive components, such as in Esports (Martin-Niedecken & Schättin, 2020) or surgery (e.g., Masters, Poolton, Abernethy, & Patil, 2008). In tasks like these, cognitive fatigue may prime greater verbal-analytical processing, which might facilitate cognitive components of the task, such as decision-making.

References

- Baddeley, A. (1992). Working memory. *Science*, 255(5044), 556-559. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1736359>
- Baumeister, J., Reinecke, K., Liesen, H., & Weiss, M. (2008). Cortical activity of skilled performance in a complex sports related motor task. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 104(4), 625-631. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-008-0811-x>
- Bernstein, N. A. (1996). On dexterity and its development. In M. L. Latash & M. T. Turvey (Eds.), *Dexterity and its development* (pp. 3–246). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum

- 849 Bo, J., & Seidler, R. D. (2009). Visuospatial working memory capacity predicts the
850 organization of acquired explicit motor sequences. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 101(6),
851 3116-3125. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00006.2009>
- 852 Boksem, M. A., Meijman, T. F., & Lorist, M. M. (2005). Effects of mental fatigue on attention:
853 An ERP study. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 25(1), 107-116.
854 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogbrainres.2005.04.011>
- 855 Boksem, M. A., Meijman, T. F., & Lorist, M. M. (2006). Mental fatigue, motivation and action
856 monitoring. *Biological Psychology*, 72(2), 123-132.
857 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2005.08.007>
- 858 Borrigan, G., Guerrero-Mosquera, C., Guillaume, C., Slama, H., & Peigneux, P. (2019).
859 Decreased prefrontal connectivity parallels cognitive fatigue-related performance
860 decline after sleep deprivation. An optical imaging study. *Biological Psychology*, 144,
861 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2019.03.004>
- 862 Borrigan, G., Slama, H., Destrebecqz, A., & Peigneux, P. (2016). Cognitive fatigue facilitates
863 procedural sequence learning. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 1-8.
864 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2016.00086>
- 865 Buszard, T., Farrow, D., Zhu, F. F., & Masters, R. S. W. (2016). The relationship between
866 working memory capacity and cortical activity during performance of a novel motor
867 task. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 247-254.
868 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.07.005>
- 869 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale,
870 New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- 871 Cohen, M. X. (2014). *Analyzing neural time series data: Theory and practice*. Cambridge,
872 MA: MIT Press.
- 873 Cooke, A. (2013). Ready the head and steady the heart: A review of cortical and cardiac
874 studies of preparation for action in sport. *International Review of Sport and Exercise*
875 *Psychology*, 6(1), 122-138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984x.2012.724438>
- 876 Cooke, A., Gallicchio, G., Kavussanu, M., Willoughby, A., McIntyre, D., & Ring, C. (2015).
877 Premovement high-alpha power is modulated by previous movement errors: Indirect
878 evidence to endorse high-alpha power as a marker of resource allocation during motor
879 programming. *Psychophysiology*, 52(7), 977-981. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12414>
- 880 Corcoran, A. W., Alday, P. M., Schlesewsky, M., & Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I. (2018).
881 Toward a reliable, automated method of individual alpha frequency (IAF)
882 quantification. *Psychophysiology*, 55(7), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13064>
- 883 Deeny, S. P., Hillman, C. H., Janelle, C. M., & Hatfield, B. D. (2003). Cortico-cortical
884 communication and superior performance in skilled marksmen: An EEG coherence
885 analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 25(2), 188-204.
886 <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.25.2.188>
- 887 Delorme, A., & Makeig, S. (2004). EEGLAB: An open source toolbox for analysis of single-
888 trial EEG dynamics including independent component analysis. *Journal of*
889 *Neuroscience Methods*, 134(1), 9-21.
- 890 Diamond, A. (2000). Close interrelation of motor development and cognitive development and
891 of the cerebellum and prefrontal cortex. *Child Development*, 71(1), 44-56.
892 <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00117>

- Engelhardt, L. E., Harden, K. P., Tucker-Drob, E. M., & Church, J. A. (2019). The neural architecture of executive functions is established by middle childhood. *Neuroimage*, 185, 479-489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2018.10.024>
- Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: attentional control theory. *Emotion*, 7(2), 336. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.2.336>
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175-191. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146>
- Fitts, P. M., & Posner, M. I. (1967). *Human performance*. Oxford, England: Brooks/Cole.
- Fröber, K., Raith, L., & Dreisbach, G. (2018). The dynamic balance between cognitive flexibility and stability: The influence of local changes in reward expectation and global task context on voluntary switch rate. *Psychological Research*, 82(1), 65-77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-017-0922-2>
- Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2016). Lower left temporal-frontal connectivity characterizes expert and accurate performance: High-alpha T7-Fz connectivity as a marker of conscious processing during movement. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 5(1), 14-24. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000055>
- Gallicchio, G., Cooke, A., & Ring, C. (2017). Practice makes efficient: Cortical alpha oscillations are associated with improved golf putting performance. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 6(1), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000077>
- Gomez-Herrero, G., Clercq, W., Anwar, H., Kara, O., Egiastian, K., Huffel, S., & Paesschen, W. (2006). *Automatic removal of ocular artifacts in the EEG without an EOG reference channel*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 7th Nordic Signal Processing Symposium-NORSIG.
- Grabowska, A., Gut, M., Binder, M., Forsberg, L., Rymarczyk, K., & Urbanik, A. (2012). Switching handedness: fMRI study of hand motor control in right-handers, left-handers and converted left-handers. *Acta Neurobiologiae Experimentalis*, 72(4), 439-451.
- Hallgren, K. A. (2012). Computing Inter-Rater Reliability for observational data: An overview and tutorial. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 8(1), 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.20982/tqmp.08.1.p023>
- Hansen, A. L., Johnsen, B. H., & Thayer, J. F. (2003). Vagal influence on working memory and attention. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 48(3), 263-274. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760\(03\)00073-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0167-8760(03)00073-4)
- Hart, S. G., & Staveland, L. G. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In P. A. Hancock & N. Meshkati (Eds.), *Advances in psychology*, 52. *Human mental workload* (pp. 139-183): North-Holland. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115\(08\)62386-9](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9)
- Hatfield, B. D., & Hillman, C. H. (2001). The psychophysiology of sport: A mechanistic understanding of the psychology of superior performance. In R. Singer, H. Hausenblas, & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (pp. 362-386). New York: Wiley & Sons.

- 935 Hatfield, B. D., Landers, D. M., & Ray, W. J. (1984). Cognitive processes during self-paced
936 performance: An electroencephalographic profile of skilled marksmen. *Journal of*
937 *Sport Psychology*, 6, 42-59. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsp.6.1.42>
- 938 Haufler, A. J., Spalding, T. W., Santa Maria, D. L., & Hatfield, B. D. (2000). Neuro-cognitive
939 activity during a self-paced visuospatial task, comparative EEG profiles in marksmen
940 and novice shooters. *Biological Psychology*, 53, 131-160.
941 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-0511\(00\)00047-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-0511(00)00047-8)
- 942 Haykin, S. (1996). *Adaptive filter theory* (Vol. 3rd). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- 943 Hoskens, M. C. J., Boaz-Curry, K., Buszard, T., & Masters, R. S. W. (2018, July). Working
944 memory suppression during skill acquisition: A pilot study of a new implicit motor
945 learning paradigm. *23rd Annual Congress of the European College of Sport Science*
946 *Conference*, Dublin, Ireland
- 947 Imburgio, M. J., & Orr, J. M. (2018). Effects of prefrontal tDCS on executive function:
948 Methodological considerations revealed by meta-analysis. *Neuropsychologia*, 117,
949 156–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2018.04.022>
- 950 Jaspers, H. H. (1958). The ten twenty electrode system of the International Federation.
951 *Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology*, 10, 371-375.
- 952 Jennings, J. R., Allen, B., Gianaros, P. J., Thayer, J. F., & Manuck, S. B. (2015). Focusing
953 neurovisceral integration: Cognition, heart rate variability, and cerebral blood flow.
954 *Psychophysiology*, 52(2), 214-224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.12319>
- 955 Jensen, O., & Tesche, C. D. (2002). Frontal theta activity in humans increases with memory
956 load in a working memory task. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 15, 1395-1399.
957 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1460-9568.2002.01975.x>
- 958 Jersild, A. T. (1927). *Mental set and shift*. New York: [Whole No. 89].
- 959 Just, M. A., & Carpenter, P. A. (1992). A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual
960 differences in working memory. *Psychological Review*, 99(1), 122-149.
961 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.99.1.122>
- 962 Kane, M. J., & Engle, R. W. (2002). The role of prefrontal cortex in working memory capacity,
963 executive attention, and general fluid intelligence: An individual-differences
964 perspective. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9(4), 637-671.
965 <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196323>
- 966 Karatekin, C., Lazareff, J. A., & Asarnow, R. F. (2000). Relevance of the cerebellar
967 hemispheres for executive functions. *Pediatric Neurology*, 22(2), 106-112.
968 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-8994\(99\)00128-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0887-8994(99)00128-9)
- 969 Kato, Y., Endo, H., & Kizuka, T. (2009). Mental fatigue and impaired response processes:
970 Event-related brain potentials in a Go/NoGo task. *International Journal of*
971 *Psychophysiology*, 72(2), 204-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2008.12.008>
- 972 Kaufer, D., & Lewis, D. (1999). Frontal lobe anatomy and cortical connectivity. In B. L. Miller
973 & J. L. Cummings (Eds.), *The Human Frontal Lobes* (Vol. 1, pp. 27-44): Guilford
974 Press.
- 975 Kerick, S. E., McDowell, K., Hung, T., Santa Maria, D. L., Spalding, T. W., & Hatfield, B. D.
976 (2001). The role of the left temporal region under the cognitive motor demands of
977 shooting in skilled marksmen. *Biological Psychology*, 58(3), 263-277.
978 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-0511\(01\)00116-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0301-0511(01)00116-8)

979 Kimhy, D., Crowley, O. V., McKinley, P. S., Burg, M. M., Lachman, M. E., Tun, P. A., . . .
980 Sloan, R. P. (2013). The association of cardiac vagal control and executive functioning
981 - Findings from the MIDUS study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 47(5), 628-635.
982 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2013.01.018>

983 Kirchner, W. K. (1958). Age differences in short-term retention of rapidly changing
984 information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 55(4), 352-358.
985 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043688>

986 Klimesch, W. (1999). EEG alpha and theta oscillations reflect cognitive and memory
987 performance: A review and analysis. *Brain Research Reviews*, 29(2-3), 169-195.
988 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0173\(98\)00056-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0165-0173(98)00056-3)

989 Laborde, S., Furley, P., & Schempp, C. (2015). The relationship between working memory,
990 reinvestment, and heart rate variability. *Physiology & Behavior*, 139, 430-436.
991 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.11.036>

992 Laborde, S., Mosley, E., & Mertgen, A. (2018). Vagal tank theory: The three Rs of cardiac
993 vagal control functioning - Resting, Reactivity, and Recovery. *Frontiers in*
994 *Neuroscience*, 12(458), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00458>

995 Laborde, S., Mosley, E., & Thayer, J. F. (2017). Heart rate variability and cardiac vagal tone
996 in psychophysiological research - Recommendations for experiment planning, data
997 analysis, and data reporting. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8(213), 1-18.
998 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00213>

999 Lachaux, J. P., Rodriguez, E., Martinerie, J., & Varela, F. J. (1999). Measuring phase
1000 synchrony in brain signals. *Human Brain Mapping*, 8(4), 194-208.
1001 [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0193\(1999\)8:4<194::AID-HBM4>3.0.CO;2-C](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0193(1999)8:4<194::AID-HBM4>3.0.CO;2-C)

1002 Lee, K. A., Hicks, G., & Nino-Murcia, G. (1990). Validity, and reliability of a scale to assess
1003 fatigue. *Psychiatry Research*, 36(3), 291-298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(91)90027-M)
1004 [1781\(91\)90027-M](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1781(91)90027-M)

1005 Liao, C., & Masters, R. S. W. (2001). Analogy learning: A means to implicit motor learning.
1006 *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 19(5), 307-319.
1007 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410152006081>

1008 Lorist, M. M., Bezdan, E., ten Caat, M., Span, M. M., Roerdink, J. B., & Maurits, N. M. (2009).
1009 The influence of mental fatigue and motivation on neural network dynamics; an EEG
1010 coherence study. *Brain Research*, 1270, 95-106.
1011 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2009.03.015>

1012 MacMahon, K. M. A., & Masters, R. S. W. (2002). The effects of secondary tasks on implicit
1013 motor skill performance. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 33(3), 307-324.

1014 Martin-Niedecken, A. L., & Schättin, A. (2020). Let the body'n'brain games begin: Toward
1015 innovative training approaches in eSports athletes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(138),
1016 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00138>

1017 Masters, R. S. W. (1992). Knowledge, knerves and know-how: The role of explicit versus
1018 implicit knowledge in the breakdown of a complex motor skill under pressure. *British*
1019 *Journal of Psychology*, 83(3), 343-358. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1992.tb02446.x)
1020 [8295.1992.tb02446.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1992.tb02446.x)

- 1021 Masters, R. S. W., Eves, F. F., & Maxwell, J. P. (2005, 15-19 August 2005). *Development of*
 1022 *a Movement Specific Reinvestment Scale*. Paper presented at the ISSP 11th World
 1023 Congress of Sport Psychology, Sydney, Australia.
- 1024 Masters, R. S. W., & Maxwell, J. P. (2008). The theory of reinvestment. *International Review*
 1025 *of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1(2), 160-183.
 1026 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17509840802287218>
- 1027 Masters, R. S. W., Polman, R. C. J., & Hammond, N. V. (1993). Reinvestment a dimension of
 1028 personality implicated in skill breakdown under pressure. *Personality and Individual*
 1029 *Differences*, 14(5), 655-666. <https://doi.org/0191-X869/9>
- 1030 Masters, R. S. W., Poolton, J. M., Abernethy, B., & Patil, N. G. (2008). Implicit learning of
 1031 movement skills for surgery. *ANZ Journal of Surgery*, 78(12), 1062-1064.
 1032 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1445-2197.2008.04751.x>
- 1033 Maxwell, J. P., Masters, R. S. W., & Eves, F. F. (2003). The role of working memory in motor
 1034 learning and performance. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 12(3), 376-402.
 1035 [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-8100\(03\)00005-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-8100(03)00005-9)
- 1036 Maxwell, J. P., Masters, R. S. W., Kerr, E., & Weedon, E. (2001). The implicit benefit of
 1037 learning without errors. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 54A(4),
 1038 1049-1068. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724980143000073>
- 1039 Maxwell, J. P., Masters, R. S. W., & Poolton, J. M. (2006). Performance breakdown in sport:
 1040 The roles of reinvestment and verbal knowledge. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*
 1041 *Sport*, 77(2), 271-276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2006.10599360>
- 1042 McMorris, T., Hale, B. J., Barwood, M., Costello, J., & Corbett, J. (2017). Effect of acute
 1043 hypoxia on cognition: A systematic review and meta-regression analysis. *Neuroscience*
 1044 *and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 74, 225-232.
 1045 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.01.019>
- 1046 Miller, E. K., & Cohen, J. D. (2001). An integrative theory of prefrontal cortex function.
 1047 *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 24, 167-202.
 1048 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.neuro.24.1.167>
- 1049 Miyake, A., Friedman, N. P., Emerson, M. J., Witzki, A. H., Howerter, A., & Wager, T. D.
 1050 (2000). The unity and diversity of executive functions and their contributions to
 1051 complex "Frontal Lobe" tasks: A latent variable analysis. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41(1),
 1052 49-100. <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1999.0734>
- 1053 Mueller, S. T., & Piper, B. J. (2014). The Psychology Experiment Building Language (PEBL)
 1054 and PEBL Test Battery. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 222, 250-259.
 1055 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2013.10.024>
- 1056 Neumann, D. L., & Thomas, P. R. (2008). A camera-based scoring system for evaluating
 1057 performance accuracy during a golf putting task. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3),
 1058 892-897. <https://doi.org/10.3758/brm.40.3.892>
- 1059 Nieuwenhuys, A., & Oudejans, R. R. D. (2012). Anxiety and perceptual-motor performance:
 1060 toward an integrated model of concepts, mechanisms, and processes. *Psychological*
 1061 *Research*, 76(6), 747-759. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-011-0384-x>
- 1062 Oberauer, K. (2005). Binding and inhibition in working memory: Individual and age
 1063 differences in short-term recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*,
 1064 134(3), 368-387. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.134.3.368>

O’Keeffe, K. , Hodder, S. & Lloyd, A. (2020). A comparison of methods used for inducing mental fatigue in performance research: individualised, dual-task and short duration cognitive tests are most effective, *Ergonomics*, 63:1, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2019.1687940>

Park, S. H., Lam, W. K., Hoskens, M. C. J., Uiga, L., Cooke, A. M., & Masters, R. S. W. (2020). Inhibitory control, conscious processing of movement and anxiety. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 46, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101587>

Rosselli, M., Ardila, A., Santisi, M. N., Arecco Mdel, R., Salvatierra, J., Conde, A., & Lenis, B. (2002). Stroop effect in Spanish-English bilinguals. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 8(6), 819-827. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1355617702860106>

Salthouse, T. A., Atkinson, T. M., & Berish, D. E. (2003). Executive functioning as a potential mediator of age-related cognitive decline in normal adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 132(4), 566-594. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.132.4.566>

Sauseng, P., Griesmayr, B., Freunberger, R., & Klimesch, W. (2010). Control mechanisms in working memory: A possible function of EEG theta oscillations. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 34(7), 1015-1022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2009.12.006>

Shanks, D. R., & John, M. F. S. (1994). Characteristics of dissociable human learning systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 17(3), 367-395. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00035032>

Shibasaki, H., & Hallett, M. (2006). What is the Bereitschaftspotential? *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 117(11), 2341-2356. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2006.04.025>

Soveri, A., Lehtonen, M., Karlsson, L. C., Lukasik, K., Antfolk, J., & Laine, M. (2018). Test–retest reliability of five frequently used executive tasks in healthy adults. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, 25(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23279095.2016.1263795>

Spector, A., & Biederman, I. (1976). Mental set and mental shift revisited. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 89(4), 669-679. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1421465>

Sperry, R. W. (1974). Lateral specialization in the surgically separated hemispheres. In F. O. Schmitt & F. G. Worden (Eds.), *The Neurosciences Third Study Program* (pp. 5-19). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

St Clair-Thompson, H. L. (2011). Executive functions and working memory behaviours in children with a poor working memory. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(4), 409-414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2011.02.008>

Strickland, T. L., D’Elia, L. F., James, R., & Stein, R. (1997). Stroop color-word performance of African Americans. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 11(1), 87-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13854049708407034>

Stroop, J. R. (1935). Studies of interference in serial verbal reactions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 18(6), 643-662. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054651>

Tanaka, M., Mizuno, K., Tajima, S., Sasabe, T., & Watanabe, Y. (2009). Central nervous system fatigue alters autonomic nerve activity. *Life Sciences*, 84(7-8), 235-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lfs.2008.12.004>

- 1108 Tarvainen, M. P., Niskanen, J. P., Lipponen, J. A., Ranta-Aho, P. O., & Karjalainen, P. A.
1109 (2014). Kubios HRV- Heart rate variability analysis software. *Computer Methods and*
1110 *Programs in Biomedicine*, 113(1), 210-220.
1111 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2013.07.024>
- 1112 Thayer, J. F., Hansen, A. L., Saus-Rose, E., & Johnsen, B. H. (2009). Heart rate variability,
1113 prefrontal neural function, and cognitive performance: The neurovisceral integration
1114 perspective on self-regulation, adaptation, and health. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*,
1115 37(2), 141-153. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12160-009-9101-z>
- 1116 Templeton, G. F. (2011). A two-step approach for transforming continuous variables to normal:
1117 implications and recommendations for IS research. *Communications of the Association for*
1118 *Information Systems*, 28(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.02804>
- 1119 Toner, J., & Moran, A. (2014). In praise of conscious awareness: A new framework for the
1120 investigation of “continuous improvement” in expert athletes. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
1121 5, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00769>
- 1122 Toner, J., & Moran, A. (2015). Toward an explanation of continuous improvement in expert
1123 athletes: The role of consciousness in deliberate practice. *International Journal of Sport*
1124 *Psychology*, 46(6), 666-675. <https://doi.org/10.7352/IJSP.2015.46.666>
- 1125 Trejo, L. J., K. Kubitz, R. Rosipal, R. L. Kochavi, and L. D. Montgomery. 2015. EEG-Based
1126 Estimation and Classification of Mental Fatigue. *Psychology* 6(5): 572–589.
1127 <https://doi:10.4236/psych.2015.65055>.
- 1128 Troyer, A. K., Leach, L., & Strauss, E. (2006). Aging and response inhibition: Normative data
1129 for the Victoria Stroop Test. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, 13(1), 20-35.
1130 <https://doi.org/10.1080/138255890968187>
- 1131 van der Linden, D. (2011). The urge to stop: The cognitive and biological nature of acute
1132 mental fatigue. In P. L. Ackerman (Ed.), *Cognitive fatigue: Multidisciplinary*
1133 *perspectives on current research and future applications* (pp. 149-164). Washington:
1134 American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/12343-000>
- 1135 van der Linden, D., Frese, M., & Meijman, T. F. (2003). Mental fatigue and the control of
1136 cognitive processes: Effects on perseveration and planning. *Acta Psychologica*, 113(1),
1137 45-65. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-6918\(02\)00150-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0001-6918(02)00150-6)
- 1138 van Duijn, T., Hoskens, M. C. J., & Masters, R. S. W. (2019). Analogy instructions promote
1139 efficiency of cognitive processes during hockey push-pass performance. *Sport,*
1140 *Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 8(1), 7-20.
1141 <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000142>
- 1142 Wascher, E., Rasch, B., Sanger, J., Hoffmann, S., Schneider, D., Rinkenauer, G., . . . Gutberlet,
1143 I. (2014). Frontal theta activity reflects distinct aspects of mental fatigue. *Biological*
1144 *Psychology*, 96, 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2013.11.010>
- 1145 Weippert, M., Kumar, M., Kreuzfeld, S., Arndt, D., Rieger, A., & Stoll, R. (2010). Comparison
1146 of three mobile devices for measuring R-R intervals and heart rate variability: Polar
1147 S810i, Suunto t6 and an ambulatory ECG system. *European Journal of Applied*
1148 *Physiology*, 109(4), 779-786. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00421-010-1415-9>
- 1149 Wolfgang, R. A., & Schmitt, K. (2009). *Fatigue of cognitive control in the Stroop-Task*. Paper
1150 presented at the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society.

- 1151 Yan, X., Zhang, J., Gong, Q., & Weng, X. (2011). Prolonged high-altitude residence impacts
1152 verbal working memory: An fMRI study. *Experimental Brain Research*, 208(3), 437-
1153 445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00221-010-2494-x>
- 1154 Yang, Y., Cao, S., Shields, G. S., Teng, Z., & Liu, Y. (2017). The relationships between
1155 rumination and core executive functions: A meta-analysis. *Depression and Anxiety*,
1156 34(1), 37-50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.22539>
- 1157 Yogev-Seligmann, G., Hausdorff, J. M., & Giladi, N. (2008). The role of executive function
1158 and attention in gait. *Movement Disorders*, 23(3), 329-342.
1159 <https://doi.org/10.1002/mds.21720>
- 1160 Zhang, T., Mou, D., Wang, C., Tan, F., Jiang, Y., Lijun, Z., & Li, H. (2015). Dopamine and
1161 executive function: Increased spontaneous eye blink rates correlate with better set-
1162 shifting and inhibition, but poorer updating. *International Journal of*
1163 *Psychophysiology*, 96(3), 155-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.04.010>
- 1164 Zhu, F. F., Poolton, J. M., Wilson, M. R., Maxwell, J. P., & Masters, R. S. W. (2011). Neural
1165 co-activation as a yardstick of implicit motor learning and the propensity for conscious
1166 control of movement. *Biological Psychology*, 87(1), 66-73.
1167 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsycho.2011.02.004>
- 1168 Zhu, F. F., Yeung, A. Y., Poolton, J. M., Lee, T. M. C., Leung, G. K. K., & Masters, R. S. W.
1169 (2015). Cathodal Transcranial Direct Current Stimulation over left dorsolateral
1170 prefrontal cortex area promotes implicit motor learning in a golf putting task. *Brain*
1171 *Stimulation*, 8(4), 784-786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2015.02.005>

1172 Appendix

1173 Table 1. Mean and SD values of the non-significant results for measures in Experiment 1:
1174 Part A, for each group and test.

Group	Fatigue				Non-fatigue (control)			
	Pre-test		Post-test		Pre-test		Post-test	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Inhibition-cost _{duration}	18.07	9.47	17.09	5.21	20.85	10.57	17.75	7.34
Switching-cost _{duration}	1.44	5.65	2.56	5.43	3.28	5.42	1.42	3.50
Updating score	11.50	0.69	20.75	1.62	11.62	0.74	21.14	0.96
Updating RT	757.6	175.2	703.5	170.7	844	301	815.1	303.3
Theta Fz power: Switching	0.70	3.93	4-0.6	4.95	-1.09	6.83	-2.02	3.42
Theta Fz power: Updating	-1.27	5.10	0.85	5.41	-0.12	8.53	-1.97	4.51

HRV	-0.16	0.41	-0.19	0.38	-0.01	0.35	-0.03	0.35
-----	-------	------	-------	------	-------	------	-------	------

1175

1176 Table 2. Mean and SD value for high alpha T7 power in Experiment 1: Part B for each group
 1177 by block of trials.

Group	Fatigue		Non-fatigue (control)	
	M	SD	M	SD
Block 1	-0.32	1.18	0.43	0.59
Block 2	0.56	1.32	0.32	0.89
Block 3	0.43	0.85	0.56	1.63

1178

1179